

**REMARKS**

Applicant submits that the present amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated August 28, 2009 and, thus, the application is in condition for allowance.

By this reply, claims 1, 6, 11, 16, and 18, are amended to clarify that caller ID information is converted to a first voice information/announcement, location information is converted to a second voice information/announcement, and the first and second voice information/announcements are provided to a called party. Claims 1, 5-6, 10-11, and 15, 16, 18 and 20 remain pending. Of these, claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 18, and 20 are independent. An expedited review and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 15, 16, 18, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered obvious by the hypothetical combination of Contractor (US Pub. No. 2002/0085687), in view of Saha (US Pat. No. 6,198,935), further in view of Park (U.S. Patent 6,434,126). However, since the disclosure of Park is not cited in the substantive rejection of these claims, Applicant assumes that the Office Action meant to reject the claims using only the hypothetical combination of Contractor and Saha. Specifically, it is asserted that Contractor discloses a method and network element with all of the features of the present invention as recited in the claims, except for obtaining location information from a Gateway Mobile Location Center (GMLC). It is further asserted that Saha teaches obtaining location information from a Gateway Mobile Location Center (GMLC). It is further asserted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Contractor with the teaching of Saha. Applicant respectfully traverses in light of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

With respect to independent claims 1, 6, 11, 16, and 18, there is nothing in Contractor, Saha, nor any other related art of record, alone or in combination, which discloses or fairly suggests the present invention as recited in the pending claims. Specifically, neither reference discloses or fairly suggests converting location information into voice information, and announcing the voice information to a called party, as recited in the pending claims. Contractor discloses a system wholly limited to providing caller ID information (Contractor, [0006]). Contractor does not provide for any of the necessary structure or methods to determine the location of a caller. The Office Action cites to paragraphs [0028]-[0029] of Contractor to support the assertion that Contractor discloses providing location information to an intelligent peripheral (IP) and converting the location information to voice information. However, the cited sections only relate to caller ID information. Meanwhile, Saha discloses a location determination system and method (Saha, Column 2, Lines 38-40). No disclosure is provided within its four corners regarding reporting a location of a calling party to a called party, let alone converting location information to a voice announcement. Therefore, neither reference even attempts to report a location of a party to a called party, let alone converting the location information into a voice announcement.

The Office Action responds to Applicant's previously filed amendment by stating that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Contractor with the teaching of Saha...to provide an efficient method of determining the location of a mobile station." However, the present invention is not concerned with determining the location of a mobile station, a task which is amply performed by the GMLC. The present invention attempts to report this location information to a called party, notably, by converting the location information into a voice announcement, and including the voice announcement along with

another voice announcement of the caller ID. Thus, a called party is provided a notification upon accepting the call, for instance, announcing a calling party's name and current location (Applicant's disclosure, paragraphs [0039]-[0040]). In the response to Applicant's previous arguments, the Office Action persists in focusing on Contractor's retrieval of the caller information, such as Caller ID, and that converting the caller ID into a voice announcement is helpful for mobile phone users so as not to be distracted from other activities. Notably, the Office Action provides no evidence that Contractor attempts to provide a *location information* to a called party. Rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. *See* KSR v. Teleflex (Sup. Ct. 4/30/07). Moreover, it is important to determine any apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the patent at issue, and this analysis should be made explicit. *Id.* The Office Action does not provide an explicit analysis as to how a person of ordinary skill in the art could combine the Caller ID reporting of Contractor with the location-determination of Saha to arrive at the claimed invention. For at least this reason, the rejection should be withdrawn and the independent claims found allowable.

Moreover, Park does not disclose reporting a location of a party in a voice announcement to a called party, as recited in the pending independent claims. At most, Park discloses obtaining the name information using Calling Name Address Presentation (CNAP). In no way does Park disclose any type of audible location information as claimed and stated above with respect to the hypothetical Contractor-Saha combination. Therefore, Park cannot possibly cure the defects of Contractor and Saha stated above with respect to the independent claims. Even if there was motivation to combine Contractor, Saha, and Park, *arguendo*, the combination would fail to

obviate the claimed invention. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed to issue.

Each of the dependent claims depends upon an independent claim which has been traversed above. Hence, these dependent claims, which depend therefrom, are also patentably distinct from any prior art of record. Specifically, each of claims 5, 10, and 15 depends from one of independent claims 1, 6, and 11, and therefore includes the novel and non-obvious features of the independent claims. For Applicant's foregoing reasons in favor of patentability, these claims are also not rendered unpatentable by Contractor in view of Saha and Park. For at least this reason, the rejections should be withdrawn and the claims found allowable. Further, none of the other references of record, cited but not relied upon, alone or in combination, recite, teach or fairly suggest inventions as recited in the pending claims. Thus, the rejections should be withdrawn and the application allowed to issue.

No extension of time is believed to be necessary to enter this amendment. However, if any fees are associated with the entering and consideration of this amendment, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account 50-2882.

Applicant respectfully requests an interview with the Examiner to present more evidence of the unique attributes of the present invention in person. As all of the outstanding rejections have been traversed and all of the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests issuance of a Notice of Allowance. If the undersigned attorney can assist in any matters regarding examination of this application, Examiner is encouraged to call at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 30, 2009

/Fariborz Moazzam, Reg. No. 53,339/

Fariborz Moazzam

Reg. No. 53,339

Cust. No. 65,667

MOAZZAM & ASSOCIATES, LLC

7601 Lewinsville Road, Suite 304

McLean, Virginia 22102

(703) 442-9480 (office); (703) 991-5978 (fax)